

REMARKS

The present application was filed on February 26, 2004 with claims 1 through 20. Claims 1 through 20 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification for containing an embedded hyperlink and rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Salmonsens et al. (United States Publication Number 2004/0054689).

Independent Claims 1, 8 and 14

Independent claims 1, 8 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Salmonsens et al. With regard to claims 1, 8 and 14, the Examiner asserts that Salmonsens et al. teach a controller 200 for high speed communications [0029] between a host computer 342 and at least one peripheral device 202 comprising a processor 214 for controlling communications on a bus using one or more communication functions, wherein said processor performs at least one function for said peripheral device in addition to said one or more communication functions [0033].

As discussed in the Background section of the present application for an exemplary USB implementation:

USB device controllers typically include a dedicated processor to perform USB functions, such as transmit, receive and interrupt functions. In addition, the peripheral devices typically include a primary microprocessor for performing the normal functions of the peripheral device, resulting in increased size and manufacturing costs and an inefficient use of processing resources. A need therefore exists for a USB device controller that *shares processing resources* with the primary peripheral processor.

Page 1, lines 16-23 (emphasis added).

Each independent claim requires that the processor in the controller processor “performs at least one function for said peripheral device in addition to said one or more communication functions.” Thus, the processor must control communications on a bus using one or more communication functions, and *also perform at least one function for said peripheral device*.

As set forth in Salmonsens et al., in paragraph [0033] lines 8-12, the “processor 214 is capable of executing various processes, methods, or programs to transfer information between the network 206 and the device 202 or bus 204 and to perform a wide variety of other functions.” There is no suggestion that these wide variety of other functions are “*at least one function for said peripheral device*,” as required by each independent claim.

Thus, Salmonsens et al. does not disclose or suggest a "controller for high speed communications between a host computer and at least one peripheral device, comprising a processor for controlling communications on a bus using one or more communication functions, wherein said processor performs *at least one function for said peripheral device* in addition to said one or more communication functions," as variously required by each independent claim.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 8 and 14.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-7, 9-13 and 15-20 are dependent on independent claims 1, 8 and 14, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Salmonsens et al. because of their dependency from independent claims 1, 8 and 14 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

All of the pending claims following entry of the amendments, i.e., claims 1-20, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: August 21, 2006

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560